

AMENDMENTS TO DRAWINGS:

Applicant has amended Drawing Sheet 1 of 3 to include --Prior Art-- in parentheses immediately after each of the titles, "FIG. 1" and "FIG. 2". This amendment is responsive to the Office Action (Item 1 of the Detailed Action).

Applicant has made no amendments to Sheets 2 of 3 nor 3 of 3. Nevertheless, a replacement sheet is included for each to prevent any possible confusion as to drawing numbers and/or substitutions.

Consequently, a replacement sheet is included herewith for each of the originally submitted drawing sheets, 1/3, 2/3, and 3/3.

A second complete set of sheets 1/3, 2/3, and 3/3 is also included.

REMARKS

General

By the above amendments, the Applicant has amended all claims to define the invention more particularly and distinctly so as to overcome the technical rejections and to define the invention patentably over prior art. Applicant offers appreciation and thanks to Examiner for helpful assistance rendered in telephone conferences.

The Objections to the Drawings

1. The drawings were objected to under MPEP § 608.02(g), stating that **Figures 1,2** should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated.

Applicant has corrected Drawing Sheet 1 of 3, and has inserted the legend --Prior Art-- in parentheses immediately after each of the titles, "FIG. 1" and "FIG. 2". Two copies of a replacement sheet for Drawing Sheet 1 of 3 are attached and respectfully submitted for your approval and acceptance.

The Claims Rejection Under 35 USC § 102

- 2,3. **Claim 1** was rejected as being anticipated by Christiansen (US 4,251,693).

Please see Applicant's response immediately following Items 4,5 below.

The Claims Rejection Under 35 USC § 103

- 4,5. **Claim 2** was rejected as being unpatentable over Christiansen (US 4,251,693), and further in view of Gu et al (US 6,345,088 B1).

In response to Claims rejection Items 1,2 and 3,4 above, Applicant respectfully submits the following for consideration.

The patent documents cited (i.e., those of both Christiansen and Gu et al) describe how a hookflash is "controlled".

Essence of Applicant's invention is not a method by which a hookflash is CONTROLLED, but rather a method by which it can be PHYSICALLY SIMULATED on a telephone loop WITHOUT ACTUALLY OPENING THAT LOOP.

As is well, known, typically/normally a hookflash is PHYSICALLY IMPOSED on a telephone loop by OPENING that loop for a brief, predetermined period of time. Doing so interrupts loop current, causing it to drop below a predetermined detection threshold (typically about 15 mADC), detected/recognized at the Central Office as a hookflash.

Instead, Applicant's invention applies an opposing voltage (i.e., opposing the telephone company's loop voltage) across the loop ... which remains unopened/continuous. The opposing voltage (counter EMF) causes loop current through Current Detector 4 to drop below the hookflash detection threshold EVEN THOUGH THE LOOP HAS NEVER BEEN OPENED, and the Central Office sees it as a hookflash.

In other words, a hookflash CONDITION has been created on the loop ... even though an actual hookflash (a timed opening/reclosing of the loop) has NOT. In practice this method works extremely well.

The method has definite application in complex telephony systems by allowing a hookflash CONDITION to be simulated on a telephone line: (1) at any point on the line; and (2) even though other telephony devices on the same line may be offhook.

As an example, consider an alarm system that needs to communicate an alarm condition to a remote site over a dial-up line. If there are multiple telephony devices on the same line, conventional methods require that a loop interrupting device be located between all-of-that-group-of-devices and the incoming telephone service, then connecting it back to its controlling means. Doing so can be difficult and expensive in large systems (such as campuswide telephone systems). However, a device that applies an opposing voltage across the line can be plugged into any outlet anywhere on the line to cause the same hookflash CONDITION on the loop. Thus, such an opposing-voltage-device can be located right at an associated controlling mean, and connected to the nearest convenient telephone wall outlet.

This method has not been described in prior literature, nor is its implementation obvious from prior practices or literature.

Claims rejection for the reasons set forth in the Office Action have been remedied through the amendments and considerations put forth above.

CONCLUSIONS:

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the drawings and claims are now in proper form, and that the claims all define patentably over the prior art. Therefore, Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action Applicant respectfully solicits.